

YAMAP0347USD

Serial No. 09/760,950

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present Reply, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 28-39 are pending in the present application. Claims 35-39 are amended herein to correct the preamble reference to claim 34, although these claims are not elected.

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In the Office action, the Examiner contends that the claims are drawn to two inventions:

Group I: Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 28-33, drawn to a ceramic chip inductor, classified in class 336, subclass 200; and

Group II: Claims 34-39, drawn to a greensheet, classified in class 205, subclass 78.

Applicants elect the invention of Group I, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 28-33 for prosecution in the present application. The election is made with traverse, on the ground that it is not unreasonably burdensome for the Examiner to consider both sets of claims in the same application.

Applicants note that, in setting forth the restriction requirement, the Examiner omitted claim 33. Applicants consider that this claim belongs in Group I, and have so indicated in the foregoing.

YAMAP0347USD

Serial No. 09/760,950

RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

In the Office Action, In the election of species requirement, the Examiner required that an election be made based on the following allegedly distinct species of the claimed invention:

Embodiment 1:	Fig. 1, example 1;
Embodiment 2:	Fig. 7, example 2;
Embodiment 3:	Fig. 8, example 3;
Embodiment 4:	Fig. 9, example 4;
Embodiment 5:	Fig. 10, example 5;
Embodiment 6:	example 6
Embodiment 7:	Fig. 12, example 7;
Embodiment 8:	Fig. 12, example 18 (example 8?);
Embodiment 9:	Fig. 18, example 9.

In response to the election of species requirement, Applicants elect the species of Embodiment 9, associated with Fig. 18 (19 in the Office Action), for initial consideration upon the merits.

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 28-33 are readable upon the elected species.

Claim 1 is considered to be generic to all of the species. Applicants note that the Examiner contended that no claim is generic. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is generic.

In the event issues arise as a result of the filing of this paper, or remain in the prosecution of this application, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance of the application. Should a Petition for Extension of Time be necessary for the present Reply to the outstanding Office action to be timely filed (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary) petition therefor is hereby made and, if any additional fees are required for the

YAMAP0347USD**Serial No. 09/760,950**

filng of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account #18-0988, Docket No. YAMAP0347USD.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, P.L.L.

Date: August 4, 2004
By 
Thomas W. Adams
Reg. No. 35,047

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
(216) 621-6165 (fax)

B:\Adams-Tom\Client Files\YAMA\347d\YAMA347D.2ESReply.wpd

Page 9 of 9